

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

| Audi ess . | Washington, D.C. 20231 |
|------------|------------------------|
|            |                        |

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 020,383       | 03/14/79    | Jan Heeres, et al     | JAB-287             |

Leonard P. Prusak 501 George St. New Brunswick, N.J. 08903

Γ

| PAPER NUMBER |
|--------------|
| 6            |
| <del></del>  |
|              |

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

MAY 20 1980

|   | , GROUP 120  |
|---|--|
| This application has been examined.   | ation filed on $\frac{2/28/80}{}$ This action is made final.                                 |
| A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire   |  |
| Part 1 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS A   | CTION:   |
| 1. Notice of References Cited, Form PTO-892.  | 2. Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948.   |
| 3. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.   | 4.   |
| Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION   |  |
| 1. Claims   | are pending in the application.  |
| Of the above, claims 2,3,6,7,11-1   | are pending in the application.  4 AN 1 1 are withdrawn from consideration.                  |
| 2. Claims   | have been cancelled.   |
| 3. Claims   | are allowed.   |
| 4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 2008   | 10 AND 15 are rejected.  |
| 5. Claims   | are objected to.   |
| 6. Claims   | are subject to restriction or election requirement.  |
| 7. The formal drawings filed on   | are acceptable.  |
| 8. The drawing correction request filed on  | has been approved. disapproved.  |
| 9. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S  | S.C. 119. The certified copy has   |
| been received. Inot been received. been filed   | in parent application, serial no,  |
| . filed or  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |
| 10. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance cordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1 | except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in ac-<br>1; 453 O.G. 213. |
| 11. Other   |  |

Serial No. 020,383 Art Unit 122

The claims in the case are 1 to 16.

The requirement for election of species made in paper #2, mailed June 20, 1979 is deemed proper, adhered to and is hereby made Final. There is no allowable generic claim. (37 CFR 1.141 (a)).

Claims 5,8,9 and 10 may be retain with elected claim 4.

Claims 2,3,6,7,11,12 to 14 and 16, stand withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to nonelected inventions. (37 CFR 1.142 (b)).

Claims 1 4,5,8,9,10 and 15 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC 112 lst, or 2nd paragraphs, or under 35 USC 101. The reasons are given under I-III below.

The formula of Y in claim 15 is incorrect. The names of the compounds in claims 4,5,8,9 and 10 are inconsistent with the name of the formula (f) in claims 1 and 15. (35 USC 112 2nd paragraph).

11

It is not clear how many different inventions under 35 USC 103 are defined by claims 1 and 15. How many different such inventions are defined and what are they?

III

There is no "reasonable assurance" that the scope claimed is operative for the asserted usefulness.

(In re Surrey 151 USPQ 724; MPEP 716 citing In re Quattle-baum 84 USPQ 383).

Claims 1 and 15 are rejected as being improper Markush claims because they embrace compounds that are unobvious over each other.

The traverse of the above rejections has been very carefully considered but is not persuasive of error

FI

Serial No. 020,383 Art Unit 122

The criteria for determining which compounds are obvious each other is set forth in (MPEP 706.03 (y)), 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence and in the standard set forth in Graham et al John Deere 148 PQ 459 cited in MPEP 706. It has not been shown that claims 1 and 15 meet either of these criteria.

The claims having been repeatedly rejected, the rejection is final. (164 PQ 632).

Enclosed is interview form PTOL 413. The oversight of not preparing this form at proper time is regretted.

> JOSE TOVAR EXAMINER P ART III

J. Tovar/eb

A/C 703

557-3032

05/14/80